



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

9/1

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

09/553,337

04/20/2000

Richard R. Reisman

RRR-00-004US

5134

181

7590

10/10/2006

MILES & STOCKBRIDGE PC
1751 PINNACLE DRIVE
SUITE 500
MCLEAN, VA 22102-3833

EXAMINER

PEYTON, TAMMARA R

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2182

DATE MAILED: 10/10/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/553,337

Applicant(s)

REISMAN, RICHARD R.

Examiner

Tammara R Peyton

Art Unit

2182

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 17 July 2006.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 114-152 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 114-152 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Information Disclosure Statement

It is desirable to avoid the submission of long list of documents if it can be avoided. Eliminate clearly irrelevant and marginally pertinent cumulative information. If a long list is submitted, highlight those documents which have been specifically brought to applicant's attention and/or are known to be of most significance. See *Penn Yan Boats, Inc. v. Sea Lark Boats, Inc.*, 359 F. Supp. 948, 175 USPQ 260 (S.D. Fla. 1972), *aff'd*, 479 F.2d 1338, 178 USPQ 577 (5th Cir. 1973), *cert. denied*, 414 U.S. 874 (1974). But *cf.* *Molins PLC v. Textron Inc.*, 48 F.3d 1172, 33 USPQ2d 1823 (Fed. Cir. 1995).

The information disclosure statements filed October 10, 2005 fail to comply with the provisions of 37 CFR 1.52(e) and 37CFR 1.98.

At least some of the information on the CD-ROM/DVD does not fall into any of the categories listed in 37 CFR 1.52(e)(1)

The following documents may be submitted to the Office on a compact disc in compliance with this paragraph:

- (i) A computer program listing (see § 1.96);
- (ii) A "Sequence Listing" (submitted under § 1.821(c)); or
- (iii) Any individual table (see § 1.58) if the table is more than 50 pages in length, or if the total number of pages of all of the tables in an application exceeds 100 pages in length, where a table page is a page printed on paper in conformance with paragraph (b) of this section and § 1.58(c).

Many of the data files are not in ASCII format as required by 37 CFR 1.52(e)(3)(i)

Each compact disc must conform to the International Standards Organization (ISO) 9660 standard, and the contents of each compact disc must be in compliance with the American Standard Code for Information Interchange (ASCII). CD-R discs must be finalized so that they are closed to further writing to the CD-R.

Further, the conversion of a paper document to an ASCII data format for an IDS will not usually provide an accurate and complete version. Thus the requirement for a copy of the listed document is not complied with 37 CFR 1.98(a)(2) by the CD-ROM/DVD.

The CD-ROM/DVD will not be made part of the permanent record, and the information referred to therein has not been considered as to the merits.

Applicant is advised that the date of any re-submission of any item of information contained in this information disclosure statement or the submission of any missing element(s) will be the date of submission for purposes of determining compliance with the requirements based on the time of filing the statement, including all certification requirements for statements under 37 CFR 1.97(e). See MPEP § 609.05(a).

Response to Applicant's Arguments

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 114, 116-131, 133-150, and 152, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Qmodem-Advanced Communications Operation Manual*, Version 4.0, 1989 and Microsoft Press' Computer Dictionary, 2nd Edition, 1993.

As per claims 114, 124, 127-131, 133, 146-150, and 152, *Qmodem* teaches software stored on a computer-readable storage medium at a user station configured for communications comprising:

an online service selector function (*Qmodem*), storable and executable at the user station, that enables a user at the user station to select among a plurality of available online service providers (Genie, Forbin Project, Sound of Music, etc. pgs. 108-110 – *Qmodem* Phone Book); and

a common communication function, storable and executable at the user station, that establishes a communication link between the user station and each online service, when the online service is selected.

Qmodem is software application for a user's modem. *Qmodem* software is usually pre-installed on the user's computer however executable floppy disks are provided if needed. *Qmodem* is pre-installed with a dialing directory phone book that includes access numbers for a host of online service providers that the user may choose to dial. The user may scroll down the available numbers and when a particular choice is highlighted the user may dial that highlight choice. One number in the dialing directory phone book is Genie. Genie is/was an online service provider by General Electric. *Qmodem* allows the user to select to dial into the Genie online service provider via the access number 277-4741. It is obvious that once the number is dialed and the modem connects to Genie's server, handshaking between the user's modem and the remote modem is done thereby establishing a communication link between the user station and the online provider Genie. Another example of online service providers or Bulletin Board Systems (BBS) would be the Forbin Project, Sound of Music, Hayes Support BBS or the Sail Air PCBoard. (pg. 110) Each of these online service providers has different access numbers that the user may choose to dial. Specifically, the user may choose to dial into a BBS to post messages to other BBS users in special areas devoted to a particular topic. BBS also allows user to chat online with other users, send e-mail, download and upload files, and access the Internet.

Qmodem teaches a user interface function for the phone directory, which allows the user to choose between online service providers. The user interface is standard and does not dependent upon which one of the online service provider is chosen. Further,

Qmodem enables the user to submit functional requests to the selected online service provider. (pgs. 139, 152-167, 176-179)

Qmodem does not expressly teach a user interface function that presents the user with a customized user interface for each different online service provider.

However, as understood by Examiner the generic application function disclosed in Applicant's invention provides open-ending software. After reading Applicant's arguments (10/05/05), Applicant argues that Applicant's invention is not limited to downloading of customized interface functions and cited pg. 1 lines 22-23 and pg. 13, lines 19-23 of the specification. However, Examiner does not believe that the lines cited specifically clarify that there are customized interfaces initially stored on the system. Further, the definition of "individual customized interface" is not defined by the claim in such a way that will not further distinguish the claim invention in terms of patentability, i.e. there is no clear definition of what is meant by customized interface. Examiner believes once the user selects a publisher's service and dials into the publisher's network that the publishers download to the user station an individual customized interface via connection to the publisher's service. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention that the interaction window screen of the selected online service provider would be "individually customized" with the respective application program, i.e. color, frames, layout, font color and font size, etc downloaded to the user station. Examiner does not understand why Applicant believes that of the plurality of online service providers or Bulletin Board Systems (BBS) disclosed by

Art Unit: 2182

Qmodem, the exact same interface (i.e. color, frames, layout, font color and font size) of the plurality of online service providers or BBS would be used to interact with the user. Specifically, *Qmodem* discloses a plurality of online service providers or BBS including Forbin Project, Sound of Music, Hayes Support BBS or the Sail Air PCBoard. (pg. 110) that each have individualize customized interfaces, i.e. (different use of color, frames, layout, font color and/or font size) Further, one of ordinary skill would readily recognize that any changes to the online-service provider's user interface is stored so that when the user subsequently dials into the server of the online-service providers the same changes would be reloaded.

Applicant further argued that *Qmodem* does not permit the use of a graphical user interface. Examiner is taking the position that the user of a graphical user interface with a DOS-based interface would have been an obvious implementation of a well-known interface in the art. Specifically, Microsoft Press defines a graphical user interface as "a type of display format that enables the user to choose commands, start programs, and see list of files and other options....choices can generally be activated either with the keyboard or with a mouse...for application developers, GUIs offer an environment that takes care of the direct interaction with the computer...this frees the developers to concentrate on the application without getting bogged down in the details of screen display or mouse and keyboard input...its also enables programmers to create programs that always handle frequently performed tasks...in the same way because the interface provides standard controlling mechanisms such as windows and

Art Unit: 2182

dialog boxes." (see pg. 185) It appears that applicant argued that the motivation to combine Qmodem with Microsoft is not found in a specific reference. Applicant is off the mark in arguing that the motivation to combine needs to be found in a specific reference. (*In re Oetiker*, 24 USPQ2d 1443 (CAFC 1992)) The measure is what the teachings of the references would suggest to one of ordinary skill in the art, not what the references specifically suggest. Further, it must be recognized that any judgment on obviousness is in a sense necessarily a reconstruction based upon hindsight reasoning of graphical user interfaces provided by online services. But so long as it takes into account only knowledge which was within the level of ordinary skill at the time the claimed invention was made, and does not include knowledge gleaned only from the applicant's disclosure, such a reconstruction is proper. (*See In re McLaughlin*, 443 F.2d 1392, 170 USPQ 209 (CCPA 1971)) Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill at the time the invention was made to incorporate a graphical user interface (GUI) as the user interface in *Qmodem* because the incorporation would make it easier for the user to interact with the *Qmodem* application and furthermore it is well known in the art that the incorporation of GUI is due to its ability to make interaction with other applications easier for the user.

As per claim 116, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill that, handshaking between the user's modem and the remote modem is performed using *Qmodem's* communication parameters (pg. 19) for its communication port to effectuate some data transfer between the user station and the online provider.

As per claims 117 and 136, *Qmodem* teaches an application programming interface (menu) that is user friendly (higher-level – as defined in specification pg. 15, lines 4-12) in which interaction with the user is simplified. (pgs. 139, 152-167, 176-179)

As per claims 118-123, 138-143, an object manifest is defined in the specification as conveying the status of a transport operation and to provide for additional information when needed. *Qmodem* teaches an object manifest to effectuate data transfers with communication parameters (pg. 19) for its communication port and its file transport protocols between the user station and the selected online service provider.

As per claims 125, 126, 134, 135, 137, 144, 145, *Qmodem* that wherein the user station is configured for communications with a multiplicity of independently-operated data sources via non-proprietary network (telephone switched-Internet), and further comprises a data transport function that effectuates data transfers between the user station and a selected one of the independently-operated data sources via the non-proprietary network. One of ordinary skill would readily recognize that the software application *Qmodem* would use the communication parameters (pg. 19) for its communication port to effectuate some data transfer between the user station and the online provider. It is the position of the Examiner that the software application *Qmodem*'s pre-installed dialing directory phone book gives the user the option to select between different independently operated data sources via a non-proprietary network.

Claims 115, 132, and 151, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Qmodem*-Advanced Communications Operation Manual, Version 4.0, 1989 and *Pettus*, US 6,031,977 – cited Prior Art, page # 7.

As per claims 115, 132, and 151, *Qmodem* does not expressly a set of translators and protocol drivers for each operated data source already stored on the user station, because, *Qmodem* teaches wherein the user has to download external protocols to facilitate a communication link between the user's modem and some remote modems. (*Qmodem*, pg. 32-34, pg. 153,161) However, *Pettus* discloses a local communication directory service that allows a user to browse and select information that is located on remote libraries. The user station stores a network address and service object (protocol driver) associated with each available service offered on a communication network. If the user desires to acquire access to a remote service listed in the communication directory the appropriate protocol drivers are utilized to facilitate establishment of the communication link. (*Pettus*, col. 4, lines 12-38, Fig. 11, col. 15, lines 19-col. 16, lines 1-40)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill that *Qmodem* would have been motivated to include specific protocol drivers for each operated data source, as disclosed by *Pettus*, thereby elevating the user in the details for downloading specific protocols that will facilitate a communication link between the user's modem and some remote modems.

Further, Applicant argues, "while downloading from publishers is a way of obtaining interfaces, it is not the only way. The present specification discloses, among other sources of interfaces, interfaces produced by third parties (e.g., page 40, line 26), and interfaces provided on CDs or generated in conjunction with interfaces provided on CDs (See "Examples," beginning on page 28 of the '337 specification)", however, no where in the claim does it state that such interface could be produced by third parties, however, although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. (***See In re Van Geuns, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993), In re Sporck, 55 CCPA 743, 386 F.2d 924, 155 USPQ 687 (1968)***)

Conclusion

US patent 5,630,125 by Zellweger further explores the use of DOS based applications incorporating the use of GUI.

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not

Art Unit: 2182

mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Tammara Peyton whose telephone number is (571) 272-4157. The examiner can normally be reached between 6:30 - 4:00 from Monday to Thursday, (I am off every first Friday), and 6:30-3:00 every second Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kim Huynh, can be reached on (571) 272-4147. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 305-3718. Any inquiry of a general nature of relating to the status of this application should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (571) 272-2100.

Mailed responses to this action should be sent to:

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks
Washington, D.C. 20231.

Faxes for Official/formal (After Final) communications or for informal or draft communications (please label "PROPOSED" or "DRAFT") sent to:

(703) 872-9306

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to:

USTPO, 2011 South Clark Place, Customer Window
Crystal Plaza Two, Lobby Room 1B03, Arlington, VA, 22202Crystal Park II, 2121.



Tammara Peyton

September 30, 2006

**TAMMARA PEYTON
PRIMARY EXAMINER**